

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to sheet 1 (Fig. 1), and sheet 2 (Fig. 2). Figs. 1 and 2 have been amended to add a "PRIOR ART" legend. Fig.2 has also been amended to delete reference numbers 21-26.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (1 and 2)

REMARKS

Summary

Prior to entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-13 were pending with Claims 1, 4, 6-9 and 11 being independent claims and the remaining claims (Claims 2-3, 5, 10 and 12-13) being dependent claims. Claims 11-13 have been canceled without prejudice. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-10 are pending, with Claims 1, 4 and 6-9 being independent claims.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to because they included reference numbers not mentioned in the specification, namely:

21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 in Fig. 2;

42 and 36 in Fig. 4; and

36 in Fig. 5.

Fig. 2 has been amended to delete reference numbers 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26.

The specification has been amended to include reference numbers 36 and 42.

Figs. 1 and 2 were also objected to as requiring a legend such as "Prior Art." Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to add the legend "Prior Art."

Applicant believes that the objections to the drawings have been overcome and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory matter. More specifically, the Office Action stated that "a program"

was not statutory subject matter and recommended changing the claims to recite “program stored in a computer readable medium.”

Claims 6 and 7 have been amended to recite a computer-readable medium.

Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 and 6-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Zeng (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20020159081) (hereinafter, the “Zeng” reference).

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Zeng reference further in view of Claim 4, and further in view of Horie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,113,252) (hereinafter, the Horie et al.” reference).

The invention defined in Claim 1 is characterized by the following features.

Feature 1: “determining a relationship between lightness levels and black color based on characteristics of an output device.”

Feature 2: “determining, when a black-printing compensation is applied and the input color data indicates a simple black color, output color data for a simple black color having a lightness level equivalent to a lightness level of the input color data, based on the determined relationship between lightness levels and black color.”

By virtue of the foregoing Features 1 and 2, the invention of Claim 1 is capable of outputting the color data for the simple black color having the lightness level equivalent to the lightness level of the input color data, when the black-printing compensation is applied and the input color data indicates the simple black color.

On the other hand, the Zeng reference teaches a method for converging source color data (CMYK) into destination color data (C’M’Y’K’). More specifically, the Zeng reference describes converting the source color data (CMYK) into PCS and K data, calculating the gamut-corrected output PCS’ color

data from the converted PCS, calculating output K' having the same lightness from the converted K data, and obtaining the destination color data (C'M'Y'K') using the calculated PCS' color data, the output K', and the PCS+K look-up table 80 to determine output C'M'Y'K' color data.

However, the Zeng reference fails to teach or suggest Feature 2 of Claim 1. There is no disclosure in the Zeng reference even as to the outputting of the color data for the simple black when the input color data indicates the simple black color. From the above feature disclosed in the Zeng reference that the destination color data (C'M'Y'K') is obtained by using the calculated PCS' color data, the calculated output K', and the PCS+K look-up table 80 to determine output C'M'Y'K' color data, it is obvious that the Zeng reference fails to disclose the features of the Claim 1. That is to say, the Zeng reference merely describes calculating, from the K data, the output K' having the same lightness.

Furthermore, the Horie et al. reference does not cure the defects of the Zeng reference.

As described above, the cited and applied references (Zeng and Horie et al.) do not teach or suggest all of the features of Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed allowable. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

Independent Claims 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 contain features similar to those discussed above with reference to Claim 1 and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as those discussed above with reference to Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are believed allowable. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9.

The remaining claims (Claims 2, 3, 5 and 10) are dependent claims. As discussed above, all of the independent claims are believed allowable. Therefore, the dependent claims (Claims 2, 3, 5 and 10) are also believed allowable because they depend from an allowable base claim.

Furthermore, each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, and individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

December 18, 2007

/Marlene Klein/

Date

Marlene Klein, Reg. No. 43,718
Patent Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: (949) 932-3132
Fax: (949) 932-3560